

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of July 18, 2008 in which claims 1-10 were rejected. With this paper, claims 1, 2, 4, 7 and 10 are amended, none are added and none are canceled.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Bowers (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,634, Bowers hereinafter).

With this paper, claim 1 is amended to specifically declare that the claimed device is an add-on to another, already existing electronic device. With the claimed device added on to the already existing device, the already existing device can be used as a pointing device (which means the existing device did not have such a function before the claimed device is added on). The way of using the existing device as the pointing device is that it acts together with an external electronic screen device and points to the external electronic screen device.

Claim 1 now recites: "A device for giving an already existing electronic device an auxiliary function as a pointing device, wherein at least one or more pointing components are integrated in the already existing electronic device, thus enabling the already existing electronic device to act together with an external electronic screen device, which makes use of the pointing device." All other claims are likewise amended where appropriate.

Bowers discloses a laptop computer comprising a removable trackball/mouse unit as a pointing device. As shown in Figs. 1-7, Bowers discloses that the laptop (an existing device) uses the removable trackball mouse unit (an add-on device) as the pointing device. The trackball mouse (the add-on device) acts together with the screen of the laptop (an internal unit of the existing device) and points to the screen of the laptop. This is fundamentally different from the present invention.

On the other hand, if the external electronic screen device is the screen of the laptop (24), as asserted by the Office, the pointing device would be the removable trackball mouse (30). The Office, in response to the Applicant's previous argument that Bowers'

mouse unit does not have a main function and an auxiliary function because the mouse unit only has a main function that is a pointing device, asserts that: "Unit 30 of Bowers is used as a pointing device and the unit is operated having two different functionalities one is used as a trackball attached to the housing of the laptop and the auxiliary functionality is a mouse detached from the housing of the laptop." (Page 5, lines 10-13 of the Detailed Action)

However, these two functions, trackball and detached mouse, are not the standard function and the auxiliary function as defined in the present invention. According to the present invention, there are standard function (e.g. telecommunication) of the already existing electronic device (e.g. mobile phone) and auxiliary function (pointing device) of the already existing electronic device (e.g. mobile phone), or the standard function (e.g. power source) of the already existing electronic device (e.g. battery pack) and auxiliary function (pointing device) of the already existing electronic device (e.g. battery pack). Bowers merely discloses one main function (i.e. cursor movement on the screen unit) that is effected by either the trackball or the mouse. There are no other functions (e.g. telephoning) that either the detachable mouse unit (30) may be used for.

Therefore, Bowers does not disclose a device that at least one or more pointing components are integrated in an existing electronic device, that gives the already existing electronic device an auxiliary function as a pointing device, thus enabling the already existing electronic device to act together with an external electronic screen device, which makes use of the pointing device.

The amendment present in this paper is for the purpose of clarification. The scope of the invention is not altered and no new matter is introduced. Applicant believes such an amendment does not raise a new issue and does not require further consideration and/or a new search. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Based on the above, applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1-9 based on Bowers be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowers and in view of Miyashita (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,906).

Claim 10 is dependent from claim 1.

The skilled person would not combine teachings of Miyashita and Bowers in order to arrive at the solution disclosed in claim 10, because Miyashita does not teach the mobile phone to act together with an external electronic screen device, which makes use of the pointing device as disclosed in claim 1. Miyashita merely teaches the detachable operation unit (105a) of the mobile phone having functionality as a pointing device which acts together with the display (101) of this mobile phone. Miyashita does NOT teach the detachable operation unit to act together with an external screen device as disclosed in claim 1. See Miyashita column 5, lines 1-10, and column 6, lines 17-21.

In accordance with the above, the subject matter included in claim 10 is patentable over Bowers and in view of Miyashita. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 10 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims of the application are now in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's agent urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if there are any questions.

Date: 9/16/2008

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
Tel: (203) 261-1234

Respectfully submitted,



Shiming Wu
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 56,885